



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,075	02/16/2001	Kurt P. Wachtler	TI-17462.2	6783

23494 7590 02/27/2002

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

THAI, LUAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2827

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/788,075

Applicant(s)

WACHTLER ET AL.

Examiner

Luan Thai

Art Unit

2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 February 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. This application discloses and claims only subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. 07/966,645, filed October 26, 1992, and names an inventor or inventors named in the prior application. Accordingly, this application may constitute a division. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of the filing date of the prior application, attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. 120 and 37 CFR 1.78.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of "an optical quality material" recited in claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of *50 to 150 words*. It is important that *the abstract not exceed 150 words in length* since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The

abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1, line 6, the limitation of "a thin overlay" should be changed to --a thin film overlay--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1 and 23-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maruyama et al. (4,199,777).

The figures and reference numbers referred to in this office action are used merely to indicate an example of a specific teaching and are not to be taken as limiting.

Regarding claims 1 and 23-24, Maruyama et al. (figures 1-8, specifically see figures 2-4-8) disclose a device comprising: a package having a cavity (2-9-32-33) therein; a semiconductor device (A-5-11-28-29) in the cavity. Since the

Art Unit: 2827

semiconductor device appears to comprise light emitting elements (Col. 1, lines 29+, Col. 3, lines 50+, lines 60+, Col. 4, lines 5+, Col. 5, lines 40+), the claimed of "the device having at least one optical receiver and/or transmitter" is taken to be inherent in Maruyama et al.'s semiconductor device. Maruyama et al. further disclose a thin film overlay (7-13-35) electrically connecting bond pads (3-4-10-30-31) on the semiconductor device to electrically conductive pads 14 (see figures 4) on a layer of the thin film overlay facing away from the semiconductor device; and one additional semiconductor device within the package (see figures 2 and 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 5, 8-17, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcinkiewicz et al. (5,422,513).

The figures and reference numbers referred to in this office action are used merely to indicate an example of a specific teaching and are not to be taken as limiting.

Regarding claims 1, 8-17, and 21-25, Marcinkiewicz et al. (figures 1-7, specifically see figures 4 and 7) disclose a device comprising: a package (10) having a cavity (11-14) therein; a semiconductor device (24-16a-16b) in the

cavity; a thin film overlay (19-20) electrically connecting bond pads (22) on the semiconductor device to electrically conductive pads (26) on a layer of the thin film overlay facing away from the semiconductor device, wherein the dimensions of the cavity exceed the dimensions of the semiconductor device. Marcinkiewicz et al. further disclose the thin film overlay including a first dielectric layer 18 adjacent the semiconductor device, a first conductive layer 20 formed on the first dielectric layer, a second dielectric layer 18 formed on the first dielectric layer 18 and the first conductive layer 20, a second conductive layer 20 formed on the second dielectric layer 18, wherein the first and second conductive layers 20 are formed into first and second respective conductors which are pads and planes; vias (19) filled with conductive material from bond pads 22 of the semiconductor device through the dielectric layer (18) and to the respective conductors.

Marcinkiewicz et al. do not explicitly disclose at least one optical receiver and/or transmitter being adjacent a surface of the semiconductor device. However, Marcinkiewicz et al. do disclose that the semiconductor device may be an integrated circuit chip of any type (Col. 6, lines 28+) and that the invention can apply to optical devices (Col. 2, lines 21+). It would have been obvious for an optical device, which comprises an optical receiver or transmitter formed thereon, being used in Marcinkiewicz et al.'s package.

Regarding claim 5, Marcinkiewicz et al. further disclose a hole formed through the thin film overlay 26, which overlay on semiconductor device 16a-16b.

Art Unit: 2827

9. Claims 2-3 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcinkiewicz et al. (5,422,513) in view of Nakabu et al. (4,544,989, applicant admitted prior art).

The figures and reference numbers referred to in this office action are used merely to indicate an example of a specific teaching and are not to be taken as limiting.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 18-20, the proposed device of Marcinkiewicz et al. discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention, as detailed above, except for solder balls attached to the last layer of respective conductors to be external terminals for the device.

Nakabu et al. while related to a similar high density interconnected structure design teach (see figures 1-6) solder balls 49 and polymer layer 47 attached to the last layer of conductors 44 of the thin film overlay of the package in order to form external terminals for the device package. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Nakabu et al. teachings of solder balls to Marcinkiewicz et al.'s device in order to create external terminals for the device package.

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcinkiewicz et al. (5,422,513) in view of Eichelberger (5,144,747, applicant admitted prior art).

The figures and reference numbers referred to in this office action are used merely to indicate an example of a specific teaching and are not to be taken as limiting.

Regarding claim 4, the proposed device of Marcinkiewicz et al. discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention, as detailed above, except for the package comprising a heat slug.

Eichelberger while related to a similar package design teach a heat slug 184 (see figure 14) is added to the package in order to conduct the heat away from the package. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a heat slug, as taught by Eichelberger, to Marcinkiewicz et al.'s package in order to improve the heat dissipating of the package.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcinkiewicz et al. (5,422,513) in view of Cole et al. (5,338,975).

The figures and reference numbers referred to in this office action are used merely to indicate an example of a specific teaching and are not to be taken as limiting.

Regarding claim 7, the proposed device of Marcinkiewicz et al. discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention, as detailed above, except for an adhesive for attaching the device in the cavity. Using an adhesive layer to secure a chip on a substrate is conventional in semiconductor art as taught by Cole et al. (e.g., adhesive layer 15 in figures 1-5). It would have been obvious to modify the device by using an adhesive layer to attach the semiconductor device in the cavity to secure device in the package and such modification would be within a general skill of a worker in the art.

Art Unit: 2827

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the cited arts fail to teach or render obvious the hole being back filled with an optical quality material.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan Thai whose telephone number is (703) 308-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Talbott can be reached on (703) 305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Luan Thai
February 21, 2002


DAVID L. TALBOTT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT ~~386~~
2827